UNITED STATE	ES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS	
TYLER DIVISION	
LUE SPIKE, LLC	: DOCKET NO. 6:12CV499
s.	: TYLER, TEXAS
	: MARCH 5, 2014
EXAS INSTRUMENTS, ET AL	: 10:00 A.M.
	CONFERENCE
	LE MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER, S DISTRICT JUDGE
PPEARANCES:	
OR THE PLAINTIFF:	MR. CHRISTOPHER HONEA
	MR. RANDALL GARTEISER GARTEISER HONEA
	119 W. FERGUSON
	TYLER, TX 75702
	MR. KIRK J. ANDERSON
	MR. PETER BRASHER
	44 N. SAN PEDRO SAN RAFAEL, CA 94903
	MR. CHRIS JOHNS JOHNS MARRS ELLIS & HODGE
	300 W. SIXTH, SUITE 1950
	AUSTIN, TX 78701
OR AIRBORNE, et al:	MS. MELISSA SMITH GILLAM & SMITH
	303 S. WASHINGTON
	MARSHALL, TX 75670
OR GOOGLE:	MR. LANCE LEE
	ATTORNEY AT LAW 5511 PLAZA DRIVE
	TEXARKANA, TX 75503
	MR. WALLACE WU
	ARNOLD & PORTER
	777 S. FIGUEROA, 44TH FLOOR

Case 6:12-cv-00499-RWS-CMC Document 1368 Filed 03/18/14 Page 2 of 30 PageID #:

		L6588	
			2
1	FOR AUDIBLE MAGIC, ET AL:	MR. ERIC HUGH FINDLAY MR. WALTER LACKEY	
2		FINDLAY CRAFT 6760 OLD JACKSONVILLE	
3		SUITE 101 TYLER, TX 75703	
4		MR. GABRIEL M. RAMSEY	
5		ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE 1000 MARSH ROAD	
6		MENLO PARK, CA 94025	
7			
8	FOR ADOBE & FACEBOOK:		
9		MR. PETER KERR THE DACUS FIRM	
10		821 ESE LOOP 323, SUITE 430 TYLER, TX 75701	
11		MR. EUGENE MAR	
12		FARELLA BRAUN & MARTEL 235 MONTGOMERY, 17TH FLOOR	
13		SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104	
14	FOR COGNITEC, ET AL:		
15		MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN 1120 S. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY	
16		BUILDING 2, SUITE 300 AUSTIN, TX 78746	
17			
18	FOR MORPHOTRUST, ET AL:		
19		MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS ONE MARKET, SPEAR STREET TOWER	
20		SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105	
21			
22	FOR CIVOLUTION:	MR. QUINNCY MCNEAL MAYER BROWN	
23		700 LOUISIANA, SUITE 3400 HOUSTON, TX 77002	
24			
25			

Ouc	<u> </u>	16	5589
			3
1	FOR 3	3M COGENT, ET AL:	
2			VINSON & ELKINS 2801 VIA FORTUNE, SUITE 100
3			AUSTIN, TX 78746
4	FOR I	IRDETO:	MS. DAWN JENKINS
5			DLA PIPER 2000 UNIVERSITY
6			EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303
			MD HEGIEV HILL
7	FOR 1	TECHNICOLOR:	MR. WESLEY HILL WARD & SMITH
8			1127 JUDSON ROAD, SUITE 220 LONGVIEW, TX 75606
9			
10	FOR	IPHARRO, ET AL:	MR. ERIC FINDLAY
11		IIIIIIIII	MR. WALTER LACKEY FINDLAY CRAFT
12			6760 OLD JACKSONVILLE
13			SUITE 101 TYLER, TX 75703
14			
15	FOR 1	IRIS:	MR. GIL GILLAM GILLAM & SMITH
16			303 S. WASHINGTON MARSHALL, TX 75670
17			,
18	EOD (SOUNDHOUND, ET AL:	MR. DAVID M. LACY KUSTERS
	FOR .	SOUNDHOUND, ET AL.	FENWICK & WEST
19			555 CALIFORNIA STREET 12TH FLOOR
20			SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
21			
22	FOR V	VIGGLE:	MR. JORDAN SIGALE MR. CHRISTOPHER SWICKHAMER
23			LOEB & LOEB 321 N. CLARK, SUITE 2300
24			CHICAGO, IL 60654
25			

ı	. 16	590 	
		4	
1	FOR VOBILE:	MR. SAMUEL E. STUBBS PILLSBURY WINTHROP	
2		2 HOUSTON CENTER	
3		909 FANNIN, SUITE 2000 HOUSTON, TX 77010	
4		,	
	FOR ZVETCO:	MR. ROBERT HUNTSMAN	
5		ATTORNEY AT LAW 10400 W. OVERLAND, SUITE 174	
6		BOISE, ID 83709	
7		MD ALLEM CARRIED	
8	FOR ACTV8, ET AL:	MR. ALLEN GARDNER POTTER MINTON	
9		110 N. COLLEGE, SUITE 500 TYLER, TX 75702	
10			
11	FOR CBS:	MR. ANDREW PERITO WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES	
12		201 REDWOOD SHORES PKWY REDWOOD SHORES, CA 94065	
13		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	FOR CLEAR CHANNEL:	MS. SARAH PFEIFFER	
14		O'MELVENY & MYERS 610 NEWPORT CENTER, 17TH FLOOR	
15		NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660	
16	FOR AXXONSOFT:	MR. MICHAEL SMITH	
17	TON ANNOUSOFT.	SIEBMAN BURG PHILLIPS & SMITH	
18		P.O. BOX 1556 MARSHALL, TX 75671	
19			
20	COURT REPORTER:	MS. JAN MASON	
21		OFFICIAL REPORTER 221 W. FERGUSON #100	
22		TYLER, TEXAS 75702	
23			
24	PROCEEDINGS REPORTED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY, TRANSCRIPT		
25	PRODUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION.		

16591

1 THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

COUNSEL: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Glad to see everybody here with this weather issue.

We're here in Cause Number 6:12CV499. The shorthand rendition of the caption is Blue Spike versus Texas Instruments, et al.

We'll get started this morning. Let me just make a quick statement about the goals here this morning or what we're going to be looking at. The purpose obviously to the Court of this hearing is to, number one, determine the primary issues in the case and develop a plan to quickly reach those particular issues, and second, explore the case management options for efficient and final resolution of all the claims here.

Now, I'm going to ask that we get started by having the parties introduce themselves. I'm going to have you, if you would, please -- we can do this by starting out with the Plaintiff and then we'll try to get some sense of order for the Defendants. One thing we could do for the Defendants is go ahead and -- or what we will do is introduce you by -- I guess in order of the filings. I'm trying to look here and see how that's done. Okay. Tell you what, let's just -- we'll go around the room. We'll go around the table and then the room. Don't worry about the order on this. And

16592

```
then we'll go from there.
1
2
          Please, if the Plaintiffs could introduce yourself and
 3
     state whether or not you're ready to proceed.
              MR. GARTEISER: Your Honor, Randall Garteiser for
 4
 5
     Plaintiff Blue Spike. With me today are my colleagues,
 6
     Christopher Honea, Christopher Johns, Kirk Anderson and Peter
 7
     Brasher.
8
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
9
              MR. GARTEISER: We're ready to proceed.
10
              THE COURT: All right. Welcome.
11
              MR. DACUS: Good morning, Judge. Deron Dacus here
12
     with my colleague Pete Kerr from our office. Also Eugene Mar
13
     from Farella Braun & Martel, Your Honor. We're here on behalf
14
     of Adobe and Facebook, and we are ready to proceed, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Welcome.
16
              MR. LEE: Good morning, Your Honor. Lance Lee and
17
     with me is Mr. Wallace Wu of Arnold and Porter. We're here on
18
     behalf of Google and we're ready to proceed.
19
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Good morning to
20
     you.
21
              MR. GILLAM: Good morning, Your Honor. Gil Gillam on
22
    behalf of Iris ID, ready to proceed.
23
              THE COURT: Good morning, sir.
24
              MR. GARDNER: Good morning, Your Honor. Allen
25
     Gardner here on behalf of ACTV8, Entropic, Ensequence, Shazam
```

Case 6:12-cv-00499-RWS-CMC Document 1368 Filed 03/18/14 Page 7 of 30 PageID #: 16593

and ImageWare, sir, and we are ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Did ACTV8 reach any type of settlement agreement? I saw where you had been talking about it.

MR. GARDNER: Yes, Your Honor, we reached a settlement in principle with the Plaintiff and we anticipate we will be filing dismissal papers in the near future.

THE COURT: Is that correct?

MR. GARTEISER: That's correct.

THE COURT: All right. Thanks. Yes, sir.

MR. LACY KUSTERS: David Lacy Kusters on behalf of Zeitera, Soundhound, Infinisource, Qqest, SMRTV, Nielsen Company, and specially appearing on behalf of Aoptics Technologies.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you.

MR. FINDLAY: Good morning, Your Honor. Eric Findlay and Gabe Ramsey here on behalf of the Audible Magic Defendants and a whole slew of Defendants known as their customers, and then, Your Honor, I'm also here on behalf of Viggle,
Incorporated with Mr. Jordan Sigale. I'm also here on behalf of Attributor Corporation, iPharro Media, BMAT Licensing,
Fulcrum Biometrics, NEUROtechnology, Iritech, Inc., M2SYS, LLC and Futronic Technology. We're ready to proceed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MS. SMITH: Good morning, Your Honor. Melissa Smith on behalf of Airborne Biometrics, Precise Biometrics,

25

SpeechPro, Speech Tech and TuneCore to the extent the dismissal 1 2 has not yet been ordered, and we're all ready to proceed, Your 3 Honor. 4 THE COURT: Thank you. 5 MS. SMITH: Thank you. 6 MR. SMITH: Your Honor, Michael Smith for Axxonsoft 7 U.S. and Axxonsoft, Limited, and we're ready to proceed, Your 8 Honor. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. 10 MR. HILL: Good morning, Your Honor. Wesley Hill on 11 behalf of Technicolor USA, Inc. and Technicolor SA. Your 12 Honor, I can announce that my clients and the Plaintiff have 13 reached an agreement for the dismissal of the Technicolor 14 entities. We're working on formalizing that but we expect it to be agreed and the dismissal papers filed very shortly. 15 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Good morning. 16 17 MS. PFEIFFER: Good morning, Your Honor. Sarah 18 Pfeiffer for Clear Channel Broadcasting, Inc., and we're ready 19 to proceed. 20 Thank you. THE COURT: 21 MR. DAVIS: Good morning, Your Honor. Tom Davis from 22 Morgan Lewis on behalf of MorphoTrust, MorphoTrak, Safran, L-1 23 and Kronos, and we're all ready to proceed.

THE COURT: Good morning. All the way from Houston?

MR. DAVIS: Yes, sir.

```
1
              THE COURT:
                        All right, sir. Thank you.
                                                    He gets
2
    special privileges.
             MR. STUBBS: Good morning, Your Honor. Sam Stubbs
3
    for Defendant Vobile, ready to proceed.
4
5
             THE COURT: Thank you.
             MR. BEARD: Good morning, Your Honor. Ryan Beard on
6
7
    behalf of Soundmouse and the two Cognitec entities, and we're
8
    ready to proceed.
9
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
10
             MR. MCNEAL: Good morning, Your Honor. Quinney
11
    McNeal, also from Houston.
12
             THE COURT: Do I have to say anything?
13
                       (Laughter.)
             MR. MCNEAL: On behalf of Civolution BV and
14
15
    Civolution USA, and we are ready to proceed.
16
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir.
17
             MS. JENKINS: Good morning, Your Honor. Dawn Jenkins
18
    on behalf of Irdeto USA and Irdeto BV, and we're ready to
19
    proceed.
20
             THE COURT: Good morning.
21
             MR. PERITO: Good morning, Your Honor. Andrew Perito
22
    on behalf of CBS Interactive, CBS Corp and Last.fm, Limited,
```

and we are ready to proceed, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir.

MS. HOUSTON: Good morning, Your Honor. Andrea

23

24

Houston on behalf of 3M Cogent, Inc., ZK Technology, LLC, ZK 1 2 Software Biometric Identification Technology Company, Limited, 3 and we are all also ready to proceed. 4 THE COURT: Good morning. 5 MS. HOUSTON: Good morning. MR. HUNTSMAN: Good morning, Your Honor. Robert 6 Huntsman representing Zvetco, LLC, and we're ready to proceed. 7 8 THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. 9 All right. For the record, and I don't hold anybody to 10 what I'm going to say here, but the best I can tell from the 11 allegation, the case involves digital content recognition or 12 signal abstracting technology. 13 The Plaintiff asserts claims against dozens of 14 Defendants for allegedly infringing four related patents, 15 all from the same patent family. 16 The Defendants have filed a number of fairly standard 17 answers or defenses, such as invalidity and unenforceability. I might also point out that the Audible 18 19 Magic Defendants have also filed counterclaims for unjust 20 enrichment, false advertising and infringement of Audible 21 Magic's patent, and that's Patent No. 6,834,308. 22 Now, I want to thank everyone for what I know was a 23

difficult job of putting together the Rule 26 report. very helpful to me. I know that it's quite a job on your part to get that done, especially with the manageable -- the

24

management problems that you have of getting together.

I would point out though for the Plaintiff, if you would, if you file any more cases in court, I'm serious about telling me a little bit more about your facts in your report. I use this report from time to time throughout the case to go back and take a quick look to refresh my memory on the case. It's very helpful when you don't just regurgitate your pleadings. But make that note, without any punishment involved. I'll just make that observation.

In looking at your report, it looks like there are a lot of issues. I'm not sure I'll cover all of the options of what could be done to manage the case. I guess the first obvious thing is to look at grouping the Defendants.

There's been a proposal that we have early or multiple claim construction hearings. Another was a suggestion for bellwether trials. Another was to defer until transfers have been ruled upon and a temporary stay until -- well, actually there was one suggestion that at least, if I rule on the motion to transfer, to stay the effect of those.

The other -- another option was to stay this case until all the transfers and venue issues have been decided and motions to dismiss and so forth.

Another option is to appoint a special master and -- a special master, and there are several areas or stages in the litigation that could occur. One would be to -- the most

obvious is to handle the grouping issues. Second was perhaps discovery matters and, of course, third might be for any other purposes that might arise during the case where it seemed like it might be -- might make sense.

Another option, some things that have occurred since we talked last is the Track B expedited supplemental disclosures rule that we recently adopted. We've looked at a number of these things.

And, again, I do appreciate your input and I can understand the concern on a number of people -- on the part of a number of people that seem to recur when we have a case with what we sometimes refer to as serial defendants. But these cases having at least 50 defendants do present unique scheduling issues and so we try to figure out what we can do most efficiently and the least expensively and, of course, a sense of fairness. And that's what we're striving for here today.

Now, I believe that we handled -- who was it that represented Animetrics? There were so many Defendants here. Is anybody here representing Animetrics? Okay. Your case is set for trial this afternoon.

(Laughter.)

MR. HONEA: Your Honor, if I may, there was a settlement and an agreed motion to dismiss was filed.

THE COURT: Yeah, and that's really what I wanted to

```
I didn't see that. Was that pretty much settled?
1
     clarify.
2
               MR. HONEA: Yes, Your Honor, it was settled and there
 3
     was an agreed motion filed yesterday.
 4
               THE COURT: Thank you. You filed that yesterday?
 5
               MR. HONEA: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: I'm sorry, I wasn't here.
 7
               MR. HONEA:
                          Yes.
8
               THE COURT: All right. We've got it. All right.
     We'll move on from there. We're already making progress this
9
10
     morning.
11
          Okay. Now, I would like to hear from various people,
12
     and let me just say that we do -- just for the benefit of
13
     the -- a lot of you, I know, say they don't get much out of
14
     scheduling conferences and for people that this is costing a
15
     lot of money for you to be here, that you don't feel it's
16
     directly related to your responsibility in the case, let's
17
     be as brief as possible. I've read all of your papers that
18
     you filed with me, so we don't need to repeat a lot of that
19
     other than just to give me a sketch of what comments you
20
     might quickly add or re-emphasize the importance of.
21
          So let's start out with either Mr. Honea -- was it Mr.
22
     Honea?
23
                          Yes, Your Honor.
               MR. HONEA:
24
               THE COURT:
                          I'm sorry. That was --
25
               MR. HONEA: Mr. Honea, Your Honor. Very well.
```

-16600

people don't get that on the first try.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. HONEA: Your Honor, I believe, and I don't want to speak for the Defendants, that we're reasonably close to a lot of agreements on the Scheduling Order. Three things that probably stick out, one would be that they want an extra month for invalidity contentions.

THE COURT: An extra month for what? I'm sorry.

MR. HONEA: I'm sorry. For them to serve invalidity contentions. We don't believe that they need an extra month, but if Your Honor is so inclined, we would be fine with that just to make a compromise.

The second, which is a little more contentious most likely, is that they would like to backtrack and second phase damages discovery, and we believe that to truly get to some quick and efficient resolutions that it's reasonable that damages discovery takes place on the same track with the other issues in the cases so that the parties know what we're dealing with as far as damages and financials.

And then the last, I think the third bigger issue so far that probably is coming out is the two phases for suppliers and customers, and we are not opposed to that in principle but we would like, as we pointed out in the joint statement, to have preclusive effect from the supplier trials on the customer Defendants, other than willfulness

and damages, to truly create an efficient, streamlined approach and to save everyone costs and judicial resources. We think that it doesn't make sense to split it up if we're not going to actually have some sort of binding effect on the customers.

So those are the three big issues that have kind of come out. I believe that the Defendants may point out that there are some Protective Order issues that they would like to address and some modifications to Your Honor's E-Discovery Order that you've entered already. We're taking a look at that. They have — they are quite extensive on their recommendations, but we think that right now we prefer to stick with Your Honor's proposed Protective Order and E-Discovery Order, but we're still willing to try and work out some of those before initial disclosures are due on April 4th.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Thank you, sir.

MR. HONEA: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anyone want to speak on behalf of the Defendants? And understand that while -- I mean, these groups here as far as talking this morning, it's very much appreciated when you're able to consolidate your positions. And if somebody earnestly feels like they need to add something, we certainly will give you that opportunity.

Mr. Dacus.

MR. DACUS: Thank you, Your Honor. And I'm glad the Court said that because I will attempt to speak very globally on behalf of the Defendants, but certainly without any preclusion for others standing up and voicing their opinions.

To address those issues that the Plaintiffs just addressed, the Defendants have asked for a brief extension on the invalidity contentions. We do feel strongly about that issue, but there are a couple of issues bound up in that that I want to make the Court aware of.

We do have the Plaintiff's contentions. I'll be very forthright with the Court in telling the Court, as we've said to the Plaintiff, we think there are some significant deficiencies in those contentions and we're going to work with the Plaintiff to try to address those. And if we don't get some relief from the Plaintiff, we're going to have to come to the Court and ask for some relief here on the sufficiency of those.

The second issue that comes up related to the invalidity contentions is just the sheer number of claims, Your Honor. We've got I think 110 or 115 claims being asserted.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. DACUS: So these Defendants are being asked to go do invalidity contentions on 110 or 115 claims. We have not yet asked the Court but it's certainly something we think we

might do in the very near future to ask the Court to limit the number of claims being asserted in the case, even at an earlier stage than what the model order requires, because as of now we're being asked to go do contentions on a hundred plus claims and we think that's excessive in this case. Really, in any case but certainly in this case.

So that's the issues with respect to the invalidity contentions and the purpose of the Defendants asking for some additional time.

With respect to the damage discovery, the Plaintiffs are right. The Defendants' position is that the damage discovery should be delayed. That, of course, does not in any way preclude any Defendant from providing, you know, summary sales information to the Plaintiff if they deem it necessary. And the Plaintiffs, you know, I think made some reference to the fact that they thought it was necessary to further some settlement discussions. Certainly any Defendant who wants to have those discussions is free to provide summary damage information before the actual deadline.

And then with respect to the two-phase trial proposal,

I think the Plaintiffs and Defendants are basically in

agreement on splitting it into what we've termed, quote

unquote, suppliers and customers, with the different trial

schedules and the different discovery schedules associated

with it. There may remain a discussion to be had about exactly the preclusive effect of those initial trials, but in general we're in agreement that there should be two phases.

THE COURT: All right, sir.

MR. DACUS: So that's where the Defendants are on a general basis, Your Honor. I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

THE COURT: None yet. Does anybody over here want to top up what -- did you speak for all, globally for all of them?

MR. DACUS: That was my attempt, Your Honor, but I by no means -- if someone thinks I got it wrong or thinks there's something to add, I certainly welcome them to add that.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RAMSEY: Your Honor, I might add something about the -- Gabriel Ramsey for Audible Magic and its customers.

I'll just add a gloss about the customer/supplier bifurcation issue. We are in general agreement with the Plaintiff. This was our proposal to put the customer proceedings off to much later, let the suppliers like Audible Magic litigate the merits of their own technology.

Here's what we see today. We can see that the Plaintiff is accusing these customers based solely -- we've got their infringement contentions now. They seem to be accused solely based on Audible Magic's technology. There's

nothing beyond that, and that makes sense. I mean, this was our assumption even before we saw the infringement contentions.

We're fine being -- having the customers be bound by any infringement determination as to Audible Magic's technology.

THE COURT: With no qualifications, right?

MR. RAMSEY: With a very small caveat, Your Honor. I cannot predict what might change in the future. We must have at least in concept the door open that we can come back here and say, Your Honor, the theory changed. I don't expect that to happen. It could. And we just want to keep the door open so that if we need to come back a year from now in the second phase and say the theory actually is adjusted a little bit, we need -- you know, we want to keep the door open to additional arguments that we didn't anticipate. We just -- in principle we need to have that in place. I don't think as a practical matter that that is likely to arise, frankly, the way the technology is accused.

THE COURT: All right, sir. Well, I appreciate that gloss. Thank you.

MR. DACUS: Your Honor, I failed to mention something that I know the group wants me to mention, and I know I'll be the one falling on the sword for this. But I do think it's an important issue, and the Court mentioned it earlier, these

-16606

motions to transfer venue that have been filed and the motions to stay related to it. Obviously there are a lot of Defendants who have filed those motions and that --

THE COURT: I'm going to give you some rulings on some of those, most of those this morning, all right?

MR. DACUS: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. I just obviously wanted to remind the Court that could drastically change the face of what this case looks like.

THE COURT: I understand that, and let me -- you're talking about jumping on a sword. Let me do something here just a second. I actually am to blame for that, not just responsible but to blame for that. There have been a number of -- there have just been a number of things that have occurred, and frankly, I think I dropped the ball on it. And I'm here to tell you that I should have ruled on it much earlier.

I don't know that I have ever done this, even apologized like this in my career, but I will tell you this, it's -- it's something that -- it is what is there. I mean, we just have to work from there, all right? And it's -- I guess I'm in a better position to make mistakes than maybe you are. I don't know.

MR. DACUS: I don't think there's any doubt about that, Judge.

THE COURT: And I don't mean that in any way but the

```
way that I said it, and that is that in this situation I'm
1
2
     going to rule on a number of them today and have a ruling on
 3
     those others here real quick. And I hope that this doesn't
     happen again, all right?
 4
 5
               MR. DACUS: Much appreciated, Your Honor. Thank you.
 6
               THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
               MR. GARDNER: Your Honor, Allen Gardner. Can I say
 7
8
     one thing, sir?
9
               THE COURT: Yes, sir, but I've already accepted the
10
     blame, Mr. Gardner.
11
               MR. GARDNER: No, sir, this has nothing to do with
12
     venue transfers.
13
               THE COURT: No piling on, right?
14
               MR. GARDNER: No, sir, no piling on, sir.
15
     relates to one of my clients, Ensequence, sir. We filed a
16
     motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction.
17
               THE COURT: Which Defendant is that?
18
               MR. GARDNER: Sir, it's Ensequence. You dismissed my
19
     client for lack of personal jurisdiction. Plaintiff has filed
20
     a motion to reconsider.
21
               THE COURT: Yes, I'm going to rule on that in just a
22
     minute.
23
               MR. GARDNER: Thank you, sir.
24
               THE COURT: Thank you. Appreciate that.
25
               MR. LACY KUSTERS: David Lacy Kusters. Just a
```

slightly different issue on the scheduling. There's a small 1 2 group of Defendants that have a license defense. 3 THE COURT: Right. MR. LACY KUSTERS: And want the ability to bring an 4 5 early summary judgment on their license or patent exhaustion 6 defenses and a stay of unrelated discovery until those are 7 resolved. 8 THE COURT: Right. And I will deny the stay but we'll have you a quick ruling on the other, okay? All right. 9 10 Thank you. 11 Anything else? 12 All right. Now, I'll just give you some of my thoughts 13 on where I'm -- let me first give you some rulings, like I 14 promised you. 15 On your -- on Blue Tech's motion to reconsider the 16 Ensequence ruling previously made by the Court dismissing 17 for lack of personal jurisdiction, that's denied. I'll have a memorandum confirming that. 18 19 The motion to stay discovery is denied as moot. 20 would be Document 1243. 21 The other was Document 1028. That was Document 1028, 22 that was the motion to reconsider that was denied.

Technicolor's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, no proper venue and insufficient process, that's granted. That's Document 560.

23

24

This is Cognitec Systems Corporation's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, that's Document 625, that's denied.

Cognited System GmbH motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, Number 626, I'm denying that without prejudice.

Plaintiff's motion for jurisdictional discovery from the Cognitec Defendants, Number 807, I will grant that to allow discovery of the corporate relationship between the two Cognitec entities.

Soundmouse's motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction, or in the alternative, to transfer pursuant to 1404(a), the motion to transfer is granted, that's Number 648.

Soundmouse's motion to dismiss, Number 644, is denied as moot.

Plaintiff's motion for jurisdictional discovery, Number 902, Soundmouse, is denied.

Defendants' motion to stay -- this is almost all of you -- motion to stay pending resolution of the transfer motions is denied. That's Document 1244.

Motion to sever has already been taken care of with Texas Instruments. They settled last night.

Now, I can -- I'll leave this list with Ms. Pritchard here. If anybody has questions about that, when we take a

10-----

break here in just a minute, we can get into that.

Let me also say that motions to transfer will not be ——
the effect of those will not be deferred. They'll be
treated like other motions to transfer rulings that are
granted.

My thoughts are that I'll go ahead and adopt a full schedule similar to the ones that the Defendants -- the two-tier track that you had suggested.

I had felt that I would include disclosures similar to Track B. I want to take a look at that one more time. I appreciate everybody's comments on those, especially regarding the early disclosure of your license agreements from the Plaintiff and sales information from the Defendants.

And the contentions issue, we need to -- I will -- I think we have way too many contentions and I will take steps to make sure that those are corralled.

Also, in the absence of you reaching some agreements while I take a break here, I will either appoint a mediator or a special master to evaluate whether or not subgroups — further subgroups would be appropriate or if these subgroups could proceed on the existing schedule but be grouped for purposes of briefing the various issues like mediation and possibly for trial. Second, to directly resolve — of course, it would be subject to appeal, but to resolve

discovery disputes. Third, to resolve any future disputes that come up ad hoc that make sense to coordinate everyone.

And I will tell you that the October 1st construction conference is -- is the earliest we can get to it, but that would be on the agenda. That would be the earliest that we could have that here with your scheduling.

And as I mentioned, your motions to stay, we've already covered those.

All right. I'm going to step down here. First of all, anybody that has represented in court that you've reached any type of agreement to settle, you can be excused, or if you're -- if you were fortunate enough to get the ruling that you wanted and you feel like you've finished your business with the Court, you may be excused.

But the remainder of you, after discussing these issues, I urge you to take another shot before I come out and decide just how we're going to do those matters that I said would either be subject to some type of mediation and/or a master, and we can talk about just who would be the master later on. I just want you to be thinking in that — in that vein though, that that is an alternative the Court is looking at, because I think it just requires that this be massaged and we come up with a balanced approach to efficiently move the case along and in a fair manner.

All right. Let me take one look at a piece of paper

here that I'm looking at.

I'm going to have distributed what I just told you that I would like you to reach agreement on. I put the -- I made these notes ahead of time so that -- thinking that -- I think most of them are still operative.

I do want to take a look at the issues I didn't put in here, the issue about the number of claims. I think we've got way too many, and if you'll just kind of overlay that in your discussions with one another.

I know it's hard to write down everything that I mentioned here so I've got you a sheet of paper here that you can work from and talk for a few minutes.

I'll take a break for -- at least until 11 o'clock, and if you tell me at that time that you still have a matter or two and you mention what they are, if they make sense to me, I'll extend that a few more minutes. If not, we'll come out and have some decisions for you.

Anyway, good luck. I again want to compliment you on your efforts so far and your efforts this morning to help this go as orderly as possible. Thank you.

(Recess.

THE COURT: First I want to thank everybody for helping expedite the procedure. I'm prepared to and I'm going to order the Scheduling Order for the suppliers. It will be identical to the ones we just circulated.

Let me say that you see some references to paragraphs.

As you well know, I like to give you your schedule, kind of a calendar up front so you can see it, and I like to integrate and I do integrate in my order the details, detailed discussions so that hopefully clarifies any matters we need to discuss.

Now, once we get over to -- I'm going to get you the customer schedule and I can tell you -- let me tell you this about it. Once we get over to -- let's turn over to October 15, please. Starting with the deadline to make your final election of asserted claims, that's where we'll start the tracks for the customers, and those dates will be as reflected in the Defendants' requested dates. I'll have those -- if you want to stick around here, I can have them for you before you leave. We'll go ahead and finish the hearing but I can get you copies of them.

But basically I'll give you the dates from there on.

Starting on October 15, the next — that date would be

February the 5th, 2016 for the customers. And then, rather

than read all through them here, I can tell you that we kick

them back all the way to the trial date and you can go all

the way down, and that's in September of 2016 for the trial

date on that.

I'll set out the schedules here for you here in a
minute. I just don't want to sit here and bore you and get

you the wrong numbers here in the record.

Also, if you'll look, one thing I want to point out is the April 4th deadline, the deadline to make preliminary election of asserted claims. That's been moved from July 3rd to April 4th.

The paragraph reference on -- I think I just mentioned this, refers to -- any paragraph there, that really refers to -- I just took this and cut and paste from the order that I normally give, so don't pay any attention to any designation of paragraphs.

Now, I'm going to -- I'm not going to appoint a master. What I'm going to do is I'm referring this case to Judge Craven, who will sit here in Tyler for hearings that are required, here in Tyler, to the extent you can't do them by telephone.

And you don't need to do anything other than I will refer it to Judge Craven and I will discuss with Judge Craven about the need for -- we'll take a look at the issue of subgroups. I'm not saying it's going to be done but I'm going to have her take a look at it and we'll work together on it. We will be talking on it, and I'll just tell you right now that we will have ex parte conversations because of the scheduling issues that we work between the two courts here, and we will be able to I think coordinate and take care of it. I keep my finger on the pulse of what's going

on and stay informed on it, and I have every confidence that she and I will be thinking pretty much alike on scheduling issues.

Again, I will -- if you wish to stick around here for awhile, I will go ahead and get you a customer scheduling order so that -- a pro forma order so that you can work from that, or we can actually send it to you by e-mail, whatever you prefer. But we will be working on that here to get that out here in just a few minutes.

All right. Any questions at this point?

All right. I again want to thank everybody, and I will come down and -- I say come down. I'm going to step off the bench here and meet some of you or say hello to those I haven't seen in awhile and also meet some of you I haven't. With that -- yes, sir, Mr. Hill.

MR. HILL: Your Honor, before we adjourn, earlier the Court had granted the motion to dismiss with regard to one of the two entities I represent, Technicolor SA. The remaining entity, I have made an agreement with Plaintiff during the break for a — to stipulate on the record today to a dismissal of Technicolor USA, Inc. without prejudice, so I would like to put that matter on the record.

THE COURT: All right, sir. And your opponent? Yes, sir.

MR. GARTEISER: Agreed, Your Honor.

```
30
1
               THE COURT: All right. Agreed. So done.
2
               MR. HILL: Thank you, Your Honor.
3
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Everybody is
 4
     excused, please.
 5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
     I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from
21
     the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
22
23
24
     Jan Mason
                                       Date
25
```